

by



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/750,930

12/30/2003

Chan Ho Kyung

2101-3-18

1881

7590

11/02/2005

JONATHAN Y. KANG, ESQ.
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA
14th Floor
801 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5554

EXAMINER

SHEDRICK, CHARLES TERRELL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2687

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,930	KYUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles Shedrick	2687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23-28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 1-20 are allowed.
2. Claims 23-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2687

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rollender U.S. Patent # 6,748,227 B1** in view of **3GPP TSG-T Liason Statement on “IPV6 update of stage 3 specifications”**.

Consider **claim 21** Rollender clearly show and disclose a method for identifying a mobile communications device **4 (figure 1)** in a mobile communications network **14 (figure 1)**, the method comprising: determining an identifier for a mobile communications device **4 (figure 1)**, the identifier comprising at least one of a first field, a second field, and a third field; including in the first field a mobile country code (MCC) for identifying a country to which the mobile communications device belongs; including in the second field a mobile network code (MNC) for identifying a network to which the mobile communications device belongs in the country; including in the third field a mobile station identification number (MSIN) for identifying the mobile communications device in the network (**column 4 line 50 –57, column 6 lines 55-65, columns 8-10**).

However, Rollender does not include padding values in the third field, when length of the MSIN is less than length of the third field.

In the same field of endeavor, the 3GPP TSG-T Liason Statement on “IPV6 update of stage 3 specifications” CR discusses that if the length of the IMSI is less than 15 digits there should be no padding characters between the MNC and MSIN (**CR PAGE 52**) which indirectly teaches padding in the midst of using identifiers. It is clear that if the length of the MSIN is less

Art Unit: 2687

than the third field the IMSI would be less than 15 digits and thus the need for padding in order for various network components to recognize IMSI fields distinguishably.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rollender by adding padding values to fields needed as taught by 3GPP for the purpose of communicating information across various components. By adding padding values to the identifier the IMSI can be correctly identified by network devices and components and thus properly routed through the network as discussed by Rollender.

Consider **claim 22** and **as applied to the method of claim 21**, Rollender clearly show and discloses the claimed invention except wherein the padding values are added to most significant side of the MSIN, in the third field.

However, in the same field of endeavor, the 3GPP TSG-T Liason Statement on “IPV6 update of stage 3 specifications” CR discusses that if the length of the IMSI is less than 15 digits there should be no padding characters between the MNC and MSIN (**CR PAGE 52**) which indirectly teaches padding in the midst of using identifiers. Rollender further discloses wherein a unique identifier can be added to any portion of the variable identifier (i.e., IMSI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rollender by adding padding values to fields needed as taught by 3GPP for the purpose of communicating information across various components. By adding padding values to the identifier the IMSI can be correctly identified by network devices and components and thus properly routed through the network as discussed by Rollender.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Krolopp et al. U.S. Patent # 6,122,525

Krolopp et al. U.S. Patent # 5,699,408

Chin et al. US Patent # 6,819,918, B2

Chandnani et al. U.S. Patent # 6,445,929 B2


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Shedrick whose telephone number is (571)-272-8621.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kincaid Lester can be reached on (571)-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles Shedrick
AU 2687
October 17, 2005


NICK CORSARO
PRIMARY EXAMINER